REMARKS

This Response is submitted in answer to the Examiner's Action mailed November 21, 2003, with a shortened statutory period of three months set to expire February 21, 2004. Claims 187-226 are currently pending. With this amendment, claims 187, 194, 203, 208, 215, and 224-226 have been amended.

The Examiner objected to the drawings filed October 29, 1999 because of the draftsperson's objection. Applicants originally filed informal drawings with this application on October 29, 1999. Applicants then filed formal drawings on March 23, 2000. Applicants believe the formal drawings overcome the objections to the drawings. Therefore, Applicants believe this objection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 187 and 202 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner stated that the claims needed to be changed in order to point to what is included or excluded by the claim language. Applicants have amended these claims to now describe "responsive to receiving the view event by said application mediator, sending a request event from said application mediator to said view controller that was created by said application mediator". Applicants believe this language now clearly describes what is included and excluded by the claim language. Therefore, Applicants believe this rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 187-192, 194-198, 200-204, 206-213, 215-219, and 221-226 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,108,583 issued to *Schneck* in view of U.S. Patent 4,816,653 issued to *Anderl*. This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that *Schneck* teaches a view controller by describing an "Authentication Header Generator" (reference 123 in Figure 1), and teaches an application mediator by describing an "Authentication Header Decomposer" (reference 146 in Figure 1).

The authentication header generator 123 generates authentication headers for packets that are sent from the host system that includes the authentication header generator 123. These packets are then sent to the receiver which includes the authentication header decomposer 146. If, as the Examiner states, the authentication

header generator is the view controller, then the authentication header decomposer must create the authentication header generator. In addition, since Applicants claim the application mediator creates one or more view controllers, *Schneck* must teach that the authentication header decomposer creates one or more authentication header generators.

Schneck does not teach that the authentication header decomposer creates the authentication header generator, and certainly does not teach that the authentication header decomposer creates one or more authentication header generators.

Applicants also claim the application mediator being included in a plurality of application mediators. *Schneck* does not teach a data processing system that includes a plurality of authentication header decomposers.

Applicants claim the application mediator receiving a view event and then sending a request event to the view controller that was created by the application mediator. Again, if the authentication header generator is the view controller, it must receive a view event and then send a request event to the one authentication header decomposer, of the plurality of application header decomposers, that created the application header generator. None of the references describes this.

The Examiner appears to state that the "view event" is the data displayed on the display device and is the combination of the user input and the signature. Applicants claim that the view event is generated by the view controller. This is the view controller that is created by the application mediator. The view event is then sent to the application mediator that created the view controller that generated the view event. The references do not describe these features.

None of the references describes, teaches, or suggests a view event, view controller, application mediator, or the interaction of these elements as claimed by Applicants. The various portions of the references pointed to by the Examiner do not describe, teach, or suggest these features. The authentication header generator does not teach a view controller as claimed by Applicants. The authentication header decomposer does not teach an application mediator. Neither the data displayed by a display device nor the combination of user input and signature is a view event.

Claim 207 describes "a plurality of view controllers, wherein each view controller within the plurality of view controllers handles a container and wherein the container

includes content, which is alterable by permissions, and wherein the application mediator handles permissions for the plurality of view controllers". The Examiner rejects this claim as being unpatentable over *Schneck* in view *Anderl*. However, the Examiner does not point to any part of either reference which discloses a plurality of view controllers.

The Examiner rejected claims 193, 199, 205, 214, and 220 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schneck* and *Anderl* and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,185,684 issued to *Pravetz*. This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the combination of *Schneck* and *Anderl* does not teach the permission being a set of key/value pairs, and uses *Pravetz* to supply this missing feature. The combination of *Schneck*, *Anderl*, and *Pravetz* does not describe, teach, or suggest Applicants' claims. The combination does not describe, teach, or suggest a view event, view controller, application mediator, or the interaction of these elements as claimed by Applicants.

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is now in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 02|23|04

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa L.B. Yociss
Reg. No. 36,975
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Attorney for Applicants